

## **REMARKS**

### **Claim Objections-**

Claim 1 has been amended to replace the period at the end of line 2 with a semi-colon.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Petitioner respectfully offers that all 35 USC 112 rejections have effectively been traversed.

Examiner has stated that Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 112 because the term “definable as an image” is indefinite and unclear. Claim 10 has been amended so that the phrase “definable as and image” is no longer present thereby respectfully traversing the 112 rejection of Claim 10 for being indefinite and unclear.

Examiner has stated that Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC 112 because the term “symbol” is indefinite and unclear. Claim 18 has been amended so that the phrase “symbol” is no longer present thereby respectfully traversing the 112 rejection of Claim 10 for being indefinite and unclear.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)**

Examiner has stated that Claim 1, 3-5, 8-10, 12, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Guice (US 4,678,209).

Claim 1- Petitioner respectfully suggests that, as amended, Claim 1 traverses the rejection under 102(b) because although Guice discloses a skid resistant die insert, it does not disclose the skid resistant insert having indicia upon it wherein the indicia will leave an indicia imprint on the surface opposing the die. The current invention and Claim 1, as amended, calls for the presence of indicia which is not taught or implied by the Guice patent.

Claim 5- Petitioner respectfully suggests that, as amended, Claim 5 traverses the rejection under 102(b) because although Guice discloses textured surface depressions and coining an impression on the textured surface by a die to reduce slippage, it does not disclose the die having indicia upon it wherein the indicia will leave an indicia imprint on the textured surface by the die for the purpose of forming the indicia imprint. The current invention and Claim 5, as amended, calls for the presence of indicia which is not taught or implied by the Guice patent.

Claim 12- Petitioner respectfully suggests that, as amended, Claim 12 traverses the rejection under 102(b) because although Guice discloses surface depressions designed to reduce skidding, it does not disclose the surface depressions having indicia upon it wherein the indicia will leave an indicia imprint on the surface opposing the die. The current invention and Claim 12, as amended, calls for the presence of indicia which is not taught or implied by the Guice patent.

Petitioner respectfully suggests that Claims 3, 4, are dependant on Claim 1 and as such if Claim 1 is in condition for allowance then Claims 3 and 4 should be as well. Petitioner respectfully suggests that Claims 8 and 10 are dependant on Claim 5 and as such if Claim 5 is in condition for allowance then Claims 8 and 10 should be as well. Petitioner respectfully suggests that Claims 15, 16 are dependant on Claim 12 and as such if Claim 12 is in condition for allowance then Claims 15 and 16 should be as well.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Examiner has stated that Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103a as being patentable over Guice in view of Bee (US 5,971,086). Petitioner suggests that Guice does not disclose surface depressions of more than one-thousandths inch and does not disclose the use

of indicia as being formed by the surface depressions, Bee does not disclose the surface depressions having indicia upon it wherein the indicia will leave an indicia imprint on the surface opposing the die. The current invention and Claim 12, as amended, calls for the presence of indicia which is not taught or implied by the Guice patent. Petitioner respectfully suggests that the Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, and 14 traverse the 103 rejections as being unpatentable over Guice in view of Bee because the unique element of indicia not taught or suggested by any individual or combination of the aforementioned patents.

Respectfully submitted,

January 21, 2005

Date

Ira P. Domnitz

Ira P. Domnitz  
Registration # 50,600  
The Matthews Firm (Cust. No. 021897)  
2000 Bering Drive , Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77057  
Tel: 713-355-4200  
Fax: 713-355-9689